DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 634 EA 021 139

AUTHOR Bellon, Jerry J.; And Others
TITLE Refocusing State Reform: The Tennessee Experience.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Ladders; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Goal Orientation; *Performance Contracts; *State Action; *Teaching Conditions
IDENTIFIERS *Tennessee

ABSTRACT

After discussing the need for second-order (or structural) reform and Tennessee's leadership in "first wave" legislation, this paper describes selected aspects of Tennessee reform activities and recent events leading to client-centered control. Tennessee's Better Schools Program, consistent with "first-wave" proposals, emphasized greater control and increased teacher accountability. The program was best known for its career ladder program, which began in 1984 and featured an extended contract program component. A 1987 study of 600 teachers and 100 administrators found that monetary reward was the primary incentive for participating in the career ladder program and that teachers cited more deleterious than beneficial effects of the program. Also, there was little agreement concerning program goals and purposes. The extended contract component suffered from inconsistent funding procedures, lack of agreement concerning alternative routes to career ladder status, and lack of awareness of incentives to enhance teaching and improve the workplace. The 1987 study recommended that future Tennessee reform efforts develop clearly stated goals that are feasible, useful, and beneficial to students. The paper then summarizes some 1988 studies comprising Tennessee's refocused reform efforts. These include studies in teacher evaluation, needs assessment, extended contracts, alternative incentives, and quality of school life. Current status and future research directions are briefly outlined. (50 references) (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED308634

REFOCUSING STATE REFORM: THE TENNESSEE EXPERIENCE

by
Jerry J. Bellon
Elner C. Bellon
Mary Ann Blank
Donna JG Brian
Cheryl Ann Kershaw

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting
of the
American Educational Research Association

March 27-31, 1989
San Francisco, California

EA 021 139

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jerry J. Bellon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INTRODUCTION

A great deal of attention has been given to school reform since the publishing of A Nation at Risk in 1983. Following this publication there was a flurry of legislative activity, especially at the state level. Yet, as Wise (1988) has pointed out, there had been a substantial amount of legislative activity aimed at reforming schools prior to 1983. Nevertheless, between 1983 and 1987 there were more rules, regulations and statutes enacted nationally affecting some aspect of education than in the previous twenty years (Timar and Kirp, 1987). The flow of legislation has intended to improve education (Chubb, 1988), but there is little evidence that the legislation seeking excellence has had the desired results. Perhaps this is because up to this point school reform has focused only on "those measures that are most politically and administratively acceptable" (Chubb, 1988, p. 44).

Several writers have pointed out that no fundemental structural changes have accompanied the first wave of reform (Cuban, 1988; Timar and Kirp, 1987). Cuban (1988) describes change as either first-order or second-order. First order change is characterized by attempts "to make what already exists more efficient and more effective without disturbing the basic organizational features, without altering ways in which adults and children perform their roles" (p. 342). He goes on to say that "second-order changes introduce new goals, structures and roles that transform familiar ways of doing things into new ways of solving persistent problems" (p. 342).

First-order reform activites have depended on regulations and mandates to make schools more efficient as if problems of local educators can be fixed by actions at the federal or state level. Very often the indicators of success used by those who have supported or engineered state reform efforts have been based on numbers. For example, the number of minutes in class, the number of teachers participating in career ladder programs, or the number of pages documenting a teacher's work have been used as measures of success (Timar and Kirp, 1987).

Many groups and educational leaders are now calling for a shift in reform efforts (Passow,

1987). The shift would give local schools a larger role in the decisions that affect educators and students. Wise (1988) refers to this process as moving from state control to client control. There are many who believe that reform efforts will fail unless schools are recognized as institutions that have their own norms and goals that respond and adjust to the environments in which they exist. Schools must develop their own organizational identities from which they can create a sense of coherence and direction (Timar and Kirp, 1987).

Refocusing state reform is a complex, long term challenge. This is especially true in a state that has been a leader in first wave reform legislation. Tennessee has enacted legislation addressing sixteen of the twenty areas of reform identified in A Nation at Risk. Florida is the only state that has been as prolific as Tennessee in passing reform legislation (McClosky, 1987).

The balance of this paper includes a description of selected aspects of Tennessee reform activities and recent events that are leading to client centered control. The information has been extrapolated from a series of studies that were commissioned by the Tennessee Department of Education. The bibliography includes references used in this paper as well as some of the most important references used in the related studies.

EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN TENNESSEE

Educational reform in Tennessee was initiated by a 1981-82 comprehensive education study funded by the legislature. This study called for many of the actions that were included in the 1983 Better Schools Program proposed by Governor Lamar Alexander. The Better Schools Program was consistent with the first wave of reform proposals that were to be implemented in a number of states. These proposals emphasized greater control and increased teacher accountability. The state of Tennessee was viewed as a leader in this phase of educational reform.

The Better Schools Program was perhaps best known for the Career Ladder Program

which began in 1984. An important component of this program is the Extended Contract Program. During the 1987 legislative session two resolutions were enacted to study aspects of the Career Ladder Program. Senate Joint Resolution No. 149 directed the State Board of Education and the State Department of Education to conduct a study to determine if and how possible alternative evaluation routes for career ladder status might be developed with the findings to be reported by February 15, 1988. Senate Joint Resolution No. 150 directed the same two agencies to conduct a study to determine if and how the Extended Contract Program could be enhanced to better serve the needs of children, and for these findings to be reported by February 15, 1988.

In order to respond to the two resolutions, Commissioner of Education, Charles Smith asked Jerry Bellon, a professor at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, to head up a team to conduct the studies and make recommendations to his office no later than January 15, 1988. A project team was established in June, 1987 and a seventeen person committee of teachers, administrators, and one school board member was appointed to serve in an advisory capacity to the project team.

Study Procedures

In order to gather sufficient information concerning alternative routes to career ladder status, as directed by Resolution 149, and enhancement of the Extended Contract Program, as directed by Resolution 150, the project team determined it was necessary to study the entire Career Ladder Program. The study design included three sources of data to be collected: surveys of a large number of Tennessee teachers and administrators for their general perceptions, in depth interviews with teachers and administrators on specific topics identified by the survey findings, and an extensive review of the literature. The project team collected and analyzed data; shared procedures and findings with the advisory committee; and, after gathering the input of the Advisory Committee, formulated the final recommendations.

During the summer of 1987, an open ended questionnaire was developed, piloted, and

administered to teachers, school administrators, supervisors, and superintendents. An open ended format was selected because it elicited the actual perceptions of the respondents and allowed for widespread administration within a minimum length of time. The questionnaire focused on views of the Career Ladder Program in general, the staff development component of the Career Ladder Program, and local and state evaluation processes. For each of these areas, the respondents were asked to identify beneficial and detrimental aspects and to make recommendations for improvement. A total of 1121 teacher, 276 administrator, 66 supervisor, and 71 superintendent usable questionnaires were collected. The supervisors completed the administrator questionnaire and the superintendents completed a questionnaire adapted to their role. Using content analysis procedures, all of the questionnaires were analyzed for the total sample and for three demographic groups (certification status, region of the state, and school setting) to identify major response patterns regarding the four areas specifically addressed as well as any additional areas that emerged from the data.

The findings from the survey highlighted numerous areas regarding the Tennessee Comprehensive Education Reform Act that were of significant interest or concern to teachers and administrators. After the administration of the questionnaires, Senate Joint Resolution No. 150, which focused on the Extended Contract Program, was added to the charge of the project team. Additional study was needed, therefore, to validate the findings of the survey, to provide more in depth explanations of the patterns that were identified, and to address the Extended Contract Program. Interviews with a representative sample of teachers and administrators across the state were determined to be the most appropriate means for generating the additional information.

Feasibility as to the numbers of interviews, schools, interviewers, and time frames was determined. The legislative resolutions and the findings from the questionnaire data provided the focus for the major questions to be addressed by the interviews. Recommendations from the Advisory Committee regarding who should be interviewed, how the interviews should be conducted, and what questions should be included were addressed at this meeting as were

concerns of the project team members. As a result of this process, the following categories were selected as the major focus of the interviews: participation in and perceptions of the Career Ladder Program in general; the evaluation process (local and state); the Extended Contract Program; and alternative routes, incentives, and career satisfiers that might have an impact upon improving the existing program. Preliminary interview questions were drafted for the teacher interview and assignments were made regarding sample selection, piloting of the interviews, and training and scheduling of the interviewers. The administrator interview was finalized by adapting the teacher interview schedule where appropriate to the roles and experiences of administrators. A section was also included on the administrator interview to gather their perceptions of the teacher program as well as perceptions of their own program.

A random sample of 100 schools to be involved in the interview process was drawn by the state department staff. A total of 600 teachers and 100 administrators were to be included in the interview process with alternate teachers identified at every school site to assure a full sample of 600 teachers. The sample was drawn by schools rather than by individual teachers due to logistical constraints and a limited time frame. The sample was determined to be representative when compared with actual percentages of teachers and administrators from various geographic locations, grade levels, settings (urban, suburban, rural, small city), and levels of career ladder participation. The interviews were analyzed using content analysis procedures. Findings were derived from the total sample for both teachers and administrators. For the teacher interviews findings were also derived from the following demographic groups: certification status, region of the state, school setting, school level, experience level, and gender.

Throughout the study, a literature base was developed through library searches, examinations of documents from across the nation, papers presented at national conventions, and information gathered from program designers and educational leaders. The major areas researched included career ladder programs, merit pay/incentive programs, and evaluation. The information base was expanded by the inclusion of literature on staff development and funding of reform

efforts. The literature review included research reports, journal articles, newspaper articles, program descriptions, speeches, and interviews from Tennessee and national sources. Major trends identified in the literature were included with the preliminary findings. These findings provided a rich data source and served as a check on the perceptions of Tennessee's teachers and administrators.

Study Findings

The findings from the 1987 study are found in a two volume report of over eight hundred pages. The findings that are most pertinent to this paper are enumerated below.

1. The primary reason for participating in the Career Ladder Program was for monetary rewards.
2. There was very little agreement about the goals and purposes of the Career Ladder Program.
3. Detrimental aspects of the Career Ladder Program were cited by teachers three times as often as those aspects perceived to be beneficial.
4. Although teachers perceived evaluation as being important to their professional growth, they were concerned that the state evaluation program encouraged game playing, did not take into account local influences, and did not provide helpful feedback.
5. A wide range of activites were taking place in the Extended Contract Program. Many of the activities appeared to be student centered while some activities focused more on teacher, administrator, and school system needs.
6. There were many inconsistencies in the procedures used to allocate extended contract funds within local school systems.
7. There was no agreement about what might constitute alternative routes to career ladder status.

8. Teachers and administrators did not appear to be aware of incentives that could be used to enhance teaching and improve the workplace.

Recommendations

The 1987 study generated a number of recommendations that were presented to Commissioner Smith prior to the 1988 legislative session. One of the most important recommendations was that clear goals should guide all future reform efforts in Tennessee. Further, it was recommended that the goals should be feasible, have a high level of utility, and a positive impact on students. The goals should provide direction for school programs that are based on local needs. It was recommended that three major goals drive new reform efforts in Tennessee. The goals are:

1. to improve and enhance student learning,
2. to improve the quality and effectiveness of the educational workforce, and
3. to improve the quality of school life.

Recommendations were also made to change the evaluation system. The most important recommendation was for a local administrator to be involved in the evaluation process for Career Level II and III teachers. Other recommendations addressed the need for timely feedback and to reduce the amount of paperwork associated with the evaluation process.

Several recommendations were made to improve the Extended Contract Program. The most important were to separate extended contract allocations from career level status and for school systems to conduct annual needs assessments to give direction to Extended Contract Programs. The needs assessments would focus on student needs that would be the basis for extended contract proposals.

Recommendations were also made to improve professional development programs, to develop alternative incentive programs, and to sponsor research to improve the quality of school life in Tennessee. These recommendations were formulated to support the goals to improve the

quality and effectiveness of the workforce and to improve the quality of school life. It was recognized that if the recommendations were accepted additional research would be needed to develop guidelines and procedures to implement the programs.

It was pointed out that if the recommendations were accepted and supported by new legislation, the role of the State Department of Education would shift to providing technical assistance to local school systems, and to monitoring and evaluating local programs in order to assure that state guidelines are followed.

Legislative Response

The recommendations from the 1987 study were used to formulate House Bill No. 2418 and Senate Bill No. 2426 which were introduced during the 1988 legislative session. The two bills were passed unanimously and received the support of the state teachers association and the state board of education. The focus of reformers in Tennessee had begun to shift from state prescriptions to broad guidelines that placed greater responsibility on local school systems.

As a result of the new legislation the State Department of Education was given the responsibility for developing guidelines and procedures to implement the new mandates. The project team that conducted the 1987 study was asked to take the responsibility for conducting futher studies to provide the Commissioner's staff with recommendations that would be the basis for the new guidelines and procedures.

REFOCUSING REFORM EFFORTS

Several questions have to be answered if the new reform efforts are to be successful. The questions are:

1. Can local evaluators and state evaluators reach agreement about ranking teachers for Career Level II and III status?
2. What capability do local school systems have for conducting comprehensive needs

assessments?

3. What processes have local school systems used to administer extended contract activities?
4. What kinds of technical assistance should be provided to local school systems so they can conduct needs assessments and formulate appropriate extended contract proposals?
5. How can alternative incentives be used to help local school systems meet high priority needs?
6. How can the quality of school life be improved by local school systems?

These six questions helped to guide the efforts of the project team. The 1988 studies conducted by the team to respond to the questions are summarized in the remainder of this paper.

Evaluation Study

Twenty-one schools were selected to participate in this study. Several criteria were used to include the schools in the study. In each case the schools had to have teachers who had applied to be evaluated for Career Level II or III status during the fall cycle of the 1988-89 school year. Every attempt was made to identify schools that had state approved evaluation systems but that differed from the state evaluation system. Eight schools met this criterion. Finally, schools were selected that represented different areas and regions of the state.

The twenty-one principals, along with the thirty-eight teachers to be evaluated, met with members of the project team. The study procedures were discussed in detail and the teachers were assured that their participation in the study would not have any effect on their evaluation for career level status.

The major focus of the study would be on the conferences held after the state evaluators had completed their final assessment of the teachers. Principals would meet with the state evaluators in simulated sessions. The principals would bring any information that they felt would

be pertinent to the evaluation of the teachers who were participating in the study. The state evaluators would bring the information they had used to make their decisions about the teachers' career level status. The purpose of the conferences was to determine if the local and state evaluators could reach agreement about the teachers' ranking even though they would be depending on different kinds of information.

The conferences were scheduled during January and early February of 1989. Each conference was observed by a project team member who took field notes describing the interactions and processes used to reach agreement or to describe the problems not resolved. Two hours was allocated for each conference but in most cases less time was needed. The twenty-one principals had a total of thirty-eight teachers involved in the study. Preliminary findings from the study are listed below.

1. The principals provided contextual and historical information that went well beyond the information available to state evaluators.
2. The majority of the time was spent on discussing instructional processes with very little attention to student outcomes.
3. State evaluators tended to depersonalize the teacher in the process and concentrate on their data.
4. State procedures and criteria are not clearly understood by local evaluators.
5. State model competencies are not differentiated to accomodate the range of teacher expertise.
6. State evaluators appeared to appreciate the information contributed by the principals but did not want to deviate from their own data.
7. In about one half of the conferences (47%) the state evaluators and the principals reached agreement through a process of negotiation. In eleven of the conferences (29%) the information provided by the principals altered the original ranking of the state evaluators.

8. At times state evaluators disagreed with one another as well as with the principal.
9. There were mixed opinions expressed by the principals about whether local evaluators should be involved in an evaluation system that focuses on classifying teachers for additional pay. In virtually all cases the principals expressed a desire to be included in an evaluation process that is aimed at improving performance.

Guidelines for including local evaluators in Career Level II and III decisions will be developed for the 1989-90 school year. The guidelines will be finalized after the data from the evaluation study have been carefully analyzed by the project team and reviewed by the advisory committee.

Needs Assessment Study

As of January 10, 1989, 105 of Tennessee's 145 school systems had submitted a completed Needs Assessment questionnaire. The purpose of the questionnaire was to determine the extent of experience school systems have had in conducting needs assessments, the extent of data available to school systems which would be useful in needs assessments, the amount of assistance needed by school systems throughout the state to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment, the general availability of equipment useful in conducting needs assessments, and the concerns that school systems had about conducting comprehensive needs assessments. Findings are summarized below.

Eleven school systems made no mention of previously using any needs assessments. About one half of the systems (54) reported limited experience from having conducted a needs assessment for federal grants. The majority of the school systems (77) have adequate data available to conduct needs assessments. Student data consists of standardized test scores and personal student records such as attendance, grades, student referrals for discipline and/or special

help, and family background. Very few systems (14) reported having done follow-up studies of students no longer in school or assessing former students' school experiences. Many systems (67) currently have adequate data concerning individual schools within the system and some community data. Community surveys or information from community groups such as special interest groups are available. About one half of the school systems (49) reported limited goal setting experience while several systems reported having extensive sets of goals.

About one third of the school systems have personnel with the skills necessary to conduct a needs assessment. About one fourth of the systems perceived a deficit of competencies. The majority of the school systems have adequate equipment available for efficiently accumulating and presenting data.

Several school systems expressed concerns about conducting a comprehensive needs assessment. The time involved in doing a needs assessment was the biggest concern. Other frequently mentioned concerns were the expense involved, the lack of expertise of personnel, and the need for clear guidance as well as support and assistance from the State Department of Education. From the information gathered, it was determined that the majority of school systems have the capability of conducting a comprehensive needs assessment if sufficient guidance and technical assistance is available to help them meet the regulations.

While the needs assessment data were being collected, the project team conducted an extensive review of the literature on needs assessment processes and procedures. When it became apparent that many school systems would need technical assistance in order to conduct local needs assessments, a decision was made to develop a guide to assist the systems. A videotape was also prepared to elaborate on and explain the material in the guide. In late February and early March meetings were held at seven different locations in the state to orient school system representatives to the guide and videotape. Each school system received copies of the guide and a copy of the tape.

Extended Contract Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the processes used by local systems in administering Extended Contract Programs (initiation, approval, monitoring, evaluating, funding etc.). An additional purpose was to allow the personnel responsible for administering the programs the opportunity to comment on the effectiveness of current processes and to provide possible suggestions for improvement. Each of Tennessee's 145 school systems had the opportunity to participate in the study. As of January 12, 1989, 110 systems had returned the completed survey.

From the findings, it was concluded that local systems have developed procedures for administering extended contract programs. The components of the total process are addressed in a variety of ways and with varying degrees of formality. Many systems use committees, boards of education, or individual teachers and administrators to intitiate and approve extended contract activities. For most systems (83), state guidelines and students' needs are the criteria for approval of extended contract activities. Local guidelines and teacher abilities also ranked highly. Over half of the systems reported the use of system needs assessments and some expressed assessing school needs as a basis for approving activities. Respondents noted brainstorming, prioritizing, having teachers select activities from a list provided by the state, and assigning teachers to activities as part of the approval process.

Over half (59) of the systems reported using student needs as a basis for establishing priorities in approving extended contract activities. Teacher requests, needs assessments, and administrator recommendations were also used in determining priorities by approximately one third of the systems. Criteria used to place teachers in extended contract activities in almost all systems are teacher certification, abilities, and interests. Teaching experience (grade level and subject) and teacher self selection are also used by about half of the systems. Superintendent and principal recommendations are another approach to placement.

The responsibility for seeing that extended contract activities are carried out according to

approved plans lies with local personnel. Systems reported monitoring by central office administrators, school based administrators, teachers, boards of education, committees, and extended contract coordinators. In most cases the monitoring is informal through teacher comments or observations. Other means of assessment include the number of students served, written reports, student or parent opinions, and administrator evaluation. A few systems use more formal evaluation procedures such as test scores and student performance.

Some systems (17) reported satisfaction with the current procedures. Flexibility was noted as a positive aspect that enabled systems to meet their specific needs. Other systems provided suggestions for improving the administrative process. A common suggestion was to use a needs assessment process to establish and prioritize extended contract activities. Some respondents (14) advised state guidelines to restrict some of the proposed activities that may not meet the needs of the system.

Guidelines to address initiating, approving, and monitoring of extended contract activities are being developed and will be shared with school systems in meetings similar to those held to disseminate information about conducting needs assessments. These meetings will be held in April and May, 1989. Further clarification is needed before specific administrative procedures can be formulated. The guidelines will be in effect for the 1989-90 school year. All proposed activities will be approved on the basis of the properly conducted, local needs assessments and will be developed with the input of a local committee of educators.

Alternative Incentive Study

The 1987 study revealed that educators in Tennessee were not aware of many incentives that could be used to improve local school efforts. The 1988 extended contract survey included questions about incentives offered at the local level that were different from (alternative to) extended contract activities. Eleven of the 110 systems responding to the survey indicated that they had some form of incentive opportunities for teachers and/or administrators.

The project team made a decision in the summer of 1988 to conduct an extensive literature review to determine what types of incentives could be used to capitalize on the intrinsic motivation of educators so that their performance would be improved in ways that would have a positive impact on students and schools. Due to the paucity of information in Tennessee about alternative incentives, the literature review became the primary source of information for developing program guidelines.

Several important findings have been generated by the literature review. It is clear that incentives have the greatest impact when they are developed and administered at the local school site. Integrating several incentives into a comprehensive long term program has a greater impact than short term individual incentives. The most powerful incentives capitalize on intrinsic motivators such as improving student achievement and providing the opportunity to collaborate with peers to improve educational opportunities. A broad range of available incentives will provide opportunities to meet individual and group needs.

Alternative incentive program guidelines are currently being developed and will be presented with the revised extended contract guidelines in late spring of 1989. It is apparent at this time that procedures for developing and administering extended contract programs are often in conflict with incentives that capitalize on the intrinsic motivation of teachers and administrators.

Quality of School Life Study

In 1983 several researchers at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, began a study focusing on improving the quality of the educational workplace (QEW). The research was partially funded by a grant from the U. S. Office of Education. The key members and the director of the QEW project are also members of the Career Ladder Project team. The information from the QEW research has been the basis for instrumentation generated by the quality of school life (QSL) study in Tennessee.

Findings from the 1987 Career Ladder study indicated that the most important work satisfiers of teachers and administrators were not being attended to by the Career Ladder and Extended Contract Programs. In many cases these programs were actually contributing to work dissatisfaction. The 1988 project team was charged with conducting additional research in Tennessee schools to determine the most effective ways to improve the quality of school life in Tennessee.

During the fall of 1988 the instrumentation developed by the QSL research was refined and tested in several school settings. A short form of the instrument was field tested in a school system in Nova Scotia as well as with Tennessee educators. A literature review was begun in the summer of 1988 to update the reviews conducted during the previous five years. This review has continued throughout the year. Instruments to generate student and parent perceptions of the workplace are being developed to be field tested in April and May of 1989. Schools are currently being identified to take part in the spring studies.

Although no findings have been generated up to this point by the QSL research, it is expected that they will not differ significantly from the QEW findings. Several of the QEW findings emphasize the importance of involving local stakeholders in identifying conditions that should be given attention in order to improve the quality of the workplace. The most important factor in carrying out workplace improvement has been school site leadership. Leaders who were able to develop collaborative efforts among teachers and administrators have had the greatest success in improving the workplace. A finding that is expected to strongly imfluence future QSL efforts is that the unique characteristics of each school must be the basis for improvement efforts.

CURRENT STATUS

A number of efforts are underway to refocus reform in Tennessee so that there will be fewer state prescriptions and increased client control. At this point, it appears that the requirement

to have extended contract proposals developed from local needs assessments will increase local level decision making. Decisions have to be made about which student needs will have the higher priority for extended contract proposals. Local school officials will have the authority to make staffing decisions based on competence and not just on career level status. The majority of the school systems seem to welcome the opportunity to work within broad guidelines and make decisions based on their needs while others would prefer to defer to state officials.

The evaluation study indicates that there is a real dilemma facing local school principals when they are asked to participate with state evaluators in making career level decisions about their teachers. Although a great majority of the principals feel comfortable about evaluating their teachers for improving performance, many feel very uncomfortable with a process that ranks teachers for differentiated pay. Several of the principals took the position that they would take the responsibility for ranking so long as there was no outside interference from the state. Others indicated that they would prefer for the state to take the total responsibility.

The Alternative Incentive Program can foster local level decisions about what is needed to improve and strengthen the performance of educators and students. These programs will be developed within broad guidelines that emphasize the importance of attending to local student and school needs.

The Quality of School Life Program will provide an opportunity for local stakeholders to identify the workplace conditions that need attention and devise plans to make necessary improvements. School site leadership will be an important factor in the success of these programs.

The role of the State Department of Education is changing. Guidelines rather than highly prescriptive regulations are being developed. Technical assistance is needed by many school systems to develop programs that meet the guidelines. State department personnel are currently engaged in orientation and training programs so that they can more effectively provide the assistance needed by local schools.

State personnel are also going to need to develop additional competencies in order to

monitor and evaluate programs that are developed by local systems. Broad guidelines increase the amount of professional judgment needed to carry out the monitoring and evaluation functions. A small team of state department employees will also be trained to conduct program audits to assure that implementation activities are consistent with the proposals that have been funded.

The shift to client control has begun. It will be a long term effort and will require many changes in the way both state and local personnel think about their respective roles. For state personnel there are new skills, competencies, and attitudes that will be needed to effectively move important decision making to the local level. Local educators will also need to develop skills and attitudes that are necessary for effective client control of critical programs. Local school leadership will be the key to the shift from state mandates to client control. Wise (1988) has clearly stated the challenge and the need for local administrators to exercise the kind of leadership that will address their students' needs rather than simply carrying out mandated procedures.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ASCD Panel on State Policy Initiatives. (1986). School policy: A call for reason. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Bacharach, S. B., Conley, S., & Shedd, J. (1986). Beyond career ladders: Structuring teacher career development systems. Teachers College Record, 87 , 563-574.

Barro, S. M. (1985). The logic of teacher incentives. Washington, DC: The National Association of State Boards of Education.

Bellon, E. C., & Bellon, J. J. (1983) Merit pay and other incentive programs. Tennessee Educational Leadership, 10(2), 64-75.

Boyles, N. L., & Vrchota, D. (1986). Performance based compensation models: Status and potential for implementation. Ames, IA: Educational Administrators of Iowa.

Bruno, J. E. (1986). Teacher compensation and incentive programs for large urban school districts. The Elementary School Journal, 86, 425-447.

Burden, P. (1987). Establishing career ladders in teaching: A guide for policy makers. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher.

Cellio, J. J., & Jacobi, C. L. (1987). Non-salary incentives. In James R. Gress (Ed.), Incentives for excellence: Agendas and arenas (pp. 71-76). Toledo, OH: University of Toledo.

Chubb, J. E. (1988). Why the current wave of school reform will fail. The Public Interest, No. 90, 28-49.

Corcoran, T. B., Kohli, W., & White, L. (1988). District and teacher participation in decision making in urban schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Cresap, McCormick, & Paget. (1984). Teacher incentives: A tool for effective management. Reston, VA: The National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Cross, P. K. (1987). The adventures of education in wonderland: Implementing educational reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 496-509.

Cuban, L. (1988). A fundamental puzzle of school reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(5), 341-344.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Barnett, B. (1988). The evolution of teacher policy. Santa Monica. CA: The Rand Corporation, Center for Policy Research in Education.

Duke, D. L., & Stiggins, R. J. (1986). Teacher evaluation: Five keys to growth. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Dunwell, R. R. (1987). Excellence in the profession of teaching: Past, present, and future perfect. In J. R. Gress (Ed.), Incentives for excellence: Agendas and arenas (pp. 85-94). Toledo, OH: University of Toledo.

Duttweiler, P. C., & Ramos-Cancel, M. L. (1986). Perspectives on performance-based incentive plans. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Elmore, R. F., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1988). Steady work policy, practice, and the reform of American education. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Harris, L. (1986). The Metropolitan Life survey of former teachers in America. New York: Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

Harris, L., & Associates. (1984). The American teacher--The Metropolitan Life survey. New York: Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 247 230)

Hart, A. W. (1986). Career ladder effects on teacher attitudes about teacher tasks, careers, authority, and supervision. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 895)

Hart, A. W. (1987). A career ladder's effect on teacher career and work attitudes. American Educational Research Journal, 24, 479-503.

Hatry, H. P., & Greiner, J. M. (1985). Issues and case studies in teacher incentive plans. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.

Hawley, W. D. (1985). Designing and implementing performance-based career ladder plans. Educational Leadership, 43,(3), 57-61.

Johns, H. E. (1988). Teacher career ladder program: Motivator or alienator? Tennessee Education, 18(1), 10-18.

Johnson, S. M. (1984). Merit pay for teachers: A poor prescription for reform. Harvard Educational Review, 54(2), 175-181.

Lieberman, A., & Rosenholtz, S. (1987). The road to school improvement: Barriers and bridges. In John I. Goodlad (Ed.), The ecology of school renewal: Eighty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Part 1, pp. 79-98). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lutz, F. W. (1987). Education politics in Texas. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

McCloskey, G. N., Provenzo, E. F., Jr., Cohn, M. M., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1987). A profession at risk: Legislated learning as a disincentive to teaching. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 284 844)

McLaughlin, M. W., Pfeifer, R. S., Swanson-Owens, D., & Yu, S. (1986). Why teachers won't teach. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 420-426.

Martin, J., Green, J., & Palaich, R. (1986). Making teachers partners in reform (Working Paper No. TR-85-3). Denver: Education Commission of the States.

Mitchell, D. E. (1986). Six criteria for evaluating state-level education policies. Educational Leadership, 44(1), 14-16.

Mitchell, D. E., Ortiz, F. I., & Mitchell, T. K. (1987). Work orientation and job performance: The cultural basis of teaching rewards and incentives. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Murnane, R. J., & Cohen, D. K. (1986). Merit pay and the evaluation problem. Why most merit pay plans fail and a few survive. Harvard Educational Review, 56, 1-17.

Murphy, M. J. (1987). Career ladders, incentives, and compensation for teachers: The concept and the context. Thresholds in Education, 13(1), 3-5.

Ohio Department of Education. (1988). Teacher incentive programs: A survey of programs in the United States, Ohio, and selected foreign countries. Columbus, OH.

Ornstein, A. C. (1985). Considering teacher effectiveness. Clearing House, 58, 399.

Pakes, S. J., & Drews, S. A. (1987, April). A descriptive study of teacher incentive models implemented in Indiana. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Palaich, R., & Flannelly, E. (1984). Improving teacher quality through incentives. Denver: Education Commission of the States.

Passow, H. A. (1987). Present and future directions in school reform. A paper presented at the Conference on Restructuring Schooling for Quality Education: A New Reform Agenda, San Antonio, TX.

Peterson, K., & Kauchak, D. (1986). Career ladders and teacher incentives: The Utah experiment, Part 1: The implementation. Final report: Secretary's discretionary program implementation grant to develop teacher incentive structures. Salt Lake City, UT: Utah University, Department of Educational Studies. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 275 063)

Peterson, K., & Kauchak, D. (1986). Career ladders and teacher incentives: The Utah experiment, Part II. Case studies. Final report: Secretary's discretionary program implementation grant to develop teacher incentive structures. Salt Lake City, UT: Utah University, Department of Educational Studies. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 275 064)

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1986). Career ladders and merit pay: Capricious fads or fundamental reform? Elementary School Journal, 86, 513-529.

Soar, R. S., Medley, D. M., & Coker, H. (1983). Teacher evaluation: A critique of currently used methods. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 239-246.

Teacher incentive pay plans: Evaluations improving, but questions remain. (1988). ASCD Update, 30(8), 1,3.

Timar, T. B., & Kirp, D. L. (1987). Educational reform and institutional competence. Harvard Educational Review, 57(3), 308-330.

Tye, K. A., & Tye, B. B. (1984). Teacher isolation and school reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 319-322.

Wise, A. E. (1988). Legislated learning revisited. Phi Delta Kappan, 59(5), 328-332.

Wise, A. E., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1987). Licensing teachers design a teaching profession. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Wyatt, T.L., & Burch, E. (1987). The Toledo plan. In James R. Gress, (Ed.), Incentives for excellence: Agendas and arenas (pp. 34-38). Toledo, OH: University of Toledo.